

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3-9, 12 and 14-20 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 2, 10, 11, 21 and 22 are canceled by this amendment.

Applicants note that a number of editorial amendments have been made to the specification for grammatical and general readability purposes. No new matter has been added.

**I. Objection to the Specification**

Regarding the indication on page 2 of the Office Action that the foreign priority data should be included in the first line of the specification, Applicants note that while the MPEP requires that domestic priority data be included in the first line of the specification, there is no requirement that foreign priority data be included in the first line of the specification (see MPEP 201.11).

**II. Objection to the Claims**

The Examiner has objected to claim 21 for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. As noted above, claim 21 has been canceled by this amendment.

**III. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 2, 4-6, 10, 13, 15-17 and 21 contain allowable subject matter.

Regarding claim 2, Applicants note that the features recited therein have been incorporated into claim 1, and that claim 2 has been canceled. In particular, Applicants note that

claim 1 now recites the features of measuring a cluster length of each of the primary clusters; selecting a cluster whose cluster length exceeds the predetermined cluster length; and inserting a flip-flop to the selected cluster. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 10, Applicants note that the features recited therein have been substantially incorporated into independent claim 9, and that claim 10 has been canceled. In particular, Applicants note that claim 9 now recites that an operation clock frequency of the flip-flop which is inserted to the cluster that is too large to be contained in the variable logic element of the logic emulation device is higher than an operation clock frequency of a flip-flop already included in the cluster to which the flip-flop is inserted. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 9 is now in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 13, Applicants note that the features recited therein have been substantially incorporated into claim 12, and that claim 13 has been canceled. In particular, Applicants note that claim 12 now recites the features of a cluster length measuring unit operable to measure a cluster length of each of the primary clusters; a selecting unit operable to select a cluster whose cluster length exceeds a predetermined cluster length; and a circuit dividing unit operable to insert a flip-flop to the selected cluster whose length exceeds a predetermined cluster length, wherein the clustering unit is operable to re-cluster the flip-flop inserted cluster.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest such features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 21, Applicants note that the features recited therein have been substantially incorporated into independent claim 20, and that claim 20 has been canceled. In particular, Applicants note that claim 20 now recites that an operation clock frequency of the flip-flop which is to be inserted to the cluster that is too large to be contained in the variable logic element of the logic emulation device is higher than an operation clock frequency of a flip-flop already included in the cluster to which the flip-flop is to be inserted. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 21 is now in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 4-6 and claims 15-17, Applicants note that claims 4-6 depend from claim 1 and claims 15-17 depend from claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 4-6 and 15-17 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

#### **IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 10 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner has taken the position that the feature recited in claims 10 and 21 is ambiguous because it is not clear where the flip-flop is inserted. As noted above, independent claims 9 and 20 have been amended so as to substantially incorporate therein the features of claims 10 and 21, respectively, and have additionally been amended so as to address the Examiner's comments noted above regarding the ambiguity of the claims.

In this regard, Applicants note that claim 9 has been amended to recite that an operation clock frequency of the flip-flop which is inserted to the cluster that is too large to be contained in the variable logic element of the logic emulation device is higher than an operation clock frequency of a flip-flop already included in the cluster to which the flip-flop has been inserted.

Similarly, claim 20 has been amended to recite that an operation clock frequency of the flip-flop which is to be inserted to the cluster that is too large to be contained in the variable logic element of the logic emulation device is higher than an operation clock frequency of a flip-flop already included in the cluster to which the flip-flop is to be inserted.

Based on the foregoing language in claims 9 and 20, Applicants submit that both of these claims makes clear that the flip-flop is to be inserted to the cluster that is too large to be contained in the variable logic element of the logic emulation device. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph has been addressed and overcome.

#### **V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, 12, 18-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dai et al. (U.S. 5,452,239).

For the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 12 and 20 are in condition for allowance, an indication of which is kindly requested. Regarding claims 3, 7, 8, 18 and 19, Applicants note that claims 3, 7 and 8 depend from claim 1, and claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that these claims are

patentable at least by virtue of their dependency. Regarding claims 11 and 22, as noted above, these claims have been canceled.

#### VI. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Tomoo KIMURA et al.

By: Kenneth W. Fields  
Kenneth W. Fields  
Registration No. 52,430  
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/dib  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
August 15, 2006